



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The men who believed in the right and duty of employing carnal weapons were conducting the conflict on a different plane from his, but he thanked God that they were "so far advanced that they would take those weapons out of the scale of despotism and throw them into the scale of freedom. It was an indication of progress and a positive moral growth; it was one way to get up to the sublime platform of non-resistance."

What Garrison and those of his peace principles are to be most criticised for, if for anything, is that they did not find and advocate a generous practical method of the abolition of slavery in a way perfectly in harmony with their peace ideas. He ought to have known instinctively that Horace Greeley's plan of "letting the erring sisters go," however wise it might have been as compared with the awful tragedy of war, would not be tolerated. On the other hand, the success of the anti-slavery men in England in 1833 ought to have led him to the early advocacy of the policy of purchasing the freedom of the slaves. If this policy had been urged from the beginning of his work, there is little doubt that in the twenty-five years following the whole nation, South and North, could have been brought to accept it, and slavery have been ended without the shedding of a drop of blood and at much less cost than that imposed by the war.

Garrison's service to the cause of peace was, on the whole, a great one, and the world is sure in time to come round to his main views, as it has done in regard to slavery.

### The President's Lecture on the Hague Conference.

We give in full on another page that portion of President Roosevelt's recent message to Congress which is contained under the caption, "The Hague Conference." The more we study this section of the message the more we are puzzled to comprehend it. If we did not know that the author of all parts of it were the same man, we should be forced to apply to it the method of the Higher Criticism and say that the third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs, and certain sentences and phrases in the following ones, are "by a different hand."

What the President says on the proposed new Hague Conference is in general most admirable. He recites the history of its issuance, on the suggestion of the Interparliamentary Union, of invitations to the powers to send delegates to such a conference, of their ready acceptance, and of the Czar of Russia taking the initiative, after the treaty of peace was signed at Portsmouth, in recommending that the Conference be called. He says that the United States government will do everything in its power to secure the success of the Conference, "that substantial progress may be made in the cause of international peace,

justice and goodwill." Further on in the passage he says that it is "our clear duty to strive in every practicable way to bring nearer the time when the sword shall not be the arbiter among nations." He urges "that this nation do all in its power to try to further the movement and to make the result of the decisions of the Hague Conference effective." He declares that arbitration should be made the customary way of settling international disputes, in most cases, and that a general arbitration treaty should be concluded among all the nations that will be represented at the Conference. He favors the conclusion of an international agreement defining contraband of war and providing protection for neutral rights and property at sea in time of war. He even goes so far as to approve, in a mild way, of the movement, now under such vigorous way, for the creation of "something like an organization of the civilized nations," a regular international congress, that is; and though he thinks the time not ripe for immediate disarmament, he conceives it to be "possible to exercise some check upon the tendency to swell indefinitely the budgets for military expenditure." He has "a real and great desire that this second Hague Conference may mark a long stride forward in the direction of securing the peace of justice throughout the world," that "a surer method than now exists of securing justice as between nations" may be established, and that "the Golden Rule should be . . . the guiding rule of conduct among nations as among individuals."

Why could not the President have stopped here? This was substantially what ought to have been said. It was timely and constructive, and in general it was lofty in spirit and statesmanlike. It would have appealed powerfully to the world. There was not the least occasion, so far as we can see, for his making his Message an excuse for rapping peace workers over the head and reading them a humiliating lecture on their supposed "folly," their "sentimentalism," "demagoguery," and "hysterical pseudo-philanthropy." Nobody misunderstood the "general attitude" of the government toward peace. Nobody was hysterically asking impossibilities, even where it was ventured to suggest more than the President himself thought to be practicable at present. Those of whom he uses these hard names love justice as intensely as he does, and for that reason they hate war. They know as well as he that peace is normally the handmaid of justice, but they know also, as he does not seem to know, that injustice and unrighteousness and shame and dishonor are normally the handmaids of war, and that so is a whole troop of other iniquities of which he never speaks and of which he seems to have no just appreciation.

The President claims that there could be no greater calamity than for the free peoples, the enlightened, peace-loving peoples, to disarm, while leaving it open to "any barbarism or despotism to remain armed."



Has he asked himself seriously what "barbarisms" would anywhere remain to be a danger, if the more than forty powers that have been considered enlightened enough to be invited to the second Hague Conference should come to an agreement to dispense with three-fourths or nine-tenths of their armies and navies? Or, if even the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Russia and Japan should do so, what little remaining "barbarism" would be able to force a "shameful peace" upon them? The friends of peace have uniformly advocated *simultaneous* and not separate disarmament by the nations. Is Mr. Roosevelt opposed to this?

Two questions have been raised within us by the reading of this curious portion of the Hague section of the Message. Has the President gone so far as a champion of peace principles and methods that he has become alarmed lest those who remember his oft repeated praises of war as an instrument of righteousness, justice and manliness, may rise up and charge him with shameful inconsistency? And has he sought to save his face by going out of his way to reiterate and emphasize his old views? Or has the peace movement, in its enormous recent development and sweep, become so powerful that he has grown anxious lest it become too great and overmastering, and has he thrown himself into the breach to save the world from what he conceives would be so great a moral calamity?

It is difficult to find any satisfactory *motif* for these declarations of the President. The most regrettable thing about it all is that it will weaken confidence in his peace professions and lessen his power to further promote the cause. Those who have believed (as we have not believed) these professions to be largely pretences for the sake of expediency — and they are not inconsiderable in number — will be more deeply inclined than ever to believe that Mr. Roosevelt is essentially a man of war, that it is rooted in him, that he loves it, that he "speaks of his own" when he talks of it as in this Message, and that any peace hopes built upon him will prove to be broken reeds. We sincerely wish that he had kept these utterances to himself, so uncalled for were they, and so out of harmony with the noble and valuable declarations to which they are attached. The time has passed for any one who stands forward as a friend and promoter of humanity and better international relations to push to the front passionate arguments in favor of war as if it were a divine and still necessary institution.

### Index and Title Page.

Any of the subscribers to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE who keep files of the paper for binding can obtain the Index and Title Page to Volume LXVII., the volume for 1905, by sending request to the office of the American Peace Society. Enclose a one cent stamp to cover postage.

### Editorial Notes.

#### More Moderate Naval Program.

It is gratifying to see that the policy of adding every year new ships to the navy is to stop, for the present at least. In his recent Message to Congress, President Roosevelt said: "Our navy, though very small relatively to the navies of other nations, is for the present sufficient in point of numbers for our needs, and while we must constantly strive to make its efficiency higher, there need be no additions to the total number of ships now built and building, save in the way of substitution (new and efficient vessels for the old ones)." This is a very different note in the President's utterances from what we have grown accustomed to in previous years. It is a very encouraging change, provided it means anything more than a temporary halt in new constructions until the numerous ships of various classes now building are completed. What has induced the President to modify his views so much? It is probable that the new Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bonaparte, has had considerable to do with it. The Secretary, in his annual report, has taken strong ground against further increase either in the number of vessels or the size of the battleships, in exact opposition to the recommendations of his predecessor, Paul Morton. Mr. Bonaparte says: "If circumstances remain as they now are, I see no reason to suppose that the number of ships in our navy need increase; on the contrary, it is reasonable to anticipate that their number will be reduced, and even reduced materially, within the next five years." We imagine, however, that the chief ground for this change of policy has been the pressure at Washington of the tremendous growing opposition throughout the nation to the policy of costly and rapid naval expansion pursued for the last ten years — an opposition which, as will be remembered, came near to defeating in the House of Representatives the naval program of last winter. Does Secretary Bonaparte look for an international agreement at the coming Hague Conference for a material reduction in the armaments of the world? It would seem so, from the language quoted above. Some great surprises, doubtless, await the world, as a result of that Conference when it meets.

#### New British Ministry.

The Balfour Ministry has resigned and left the stage, and a Liberal Cabinet under the Premiership of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has come into office. There is a general feeling on both sides of the water that the new ministry will on the whole be more favorable to the cause of international peace than the former one; though it must be confessed that in the matter of the settlement of the